Non equilibrium stationary states of a kicked linear chain of spins coupled to a heat bath

L. Barrera,[1] A. García,[2] and P. C. López Vázquez[3]

[1]*Departamento de Física, Universidad de Guadalajara, Blvd. Marcelino García Barragan y Calzada Olímpica, C.P. 44840, Guadalajara, Jalisco, México.*
[2]*Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad de Guadalajara, Blvd. Marcelino García Barragan y Calzada Olímpica, C.P. 44840, Guadalajara, Jalisco, México.*
[3]*Departamento de Ciencias Naturales y Exactas, Universidad de Guadalajara, Carretera Guadalajara - Ameca Km. 45.5 C.P. 46600. Ameca, Jalisco, México.*

arXiv:1611.01727v1 [quant-ph] 6 Nov 2016

We consider a linear chain made of spins of one half in contact with a finite temperature environment for which periodic delta-kicks are applied to the qubits of the linear chain in two different ways: periodic kicks are applied to a single qubit and alternate kicks are applied to two qubits of the linear chain. In both cases the system reaches a non-equilibrium stationary condition in the long time limit. We study the transient to the quasi stationary condition and the properties of the quasi-steady state as function of the period of the kicks by defining averaged quantities at the quasi stationary regime. For doing our study we have derived an approximation to a master equation which serves us to analyze the effects of a finite temperature and the zero temperature environment. The linear chain we use in our model has been used as model for a quantum computer devices based on magnetic resonance techniques.

I. INTRODUCTION

The understanding of the creation of the stationary states on open systems which are subject to driving forces that keep them out of equilibrium is of great importance in the field of complex systems, comparable in importance to the fundamental ideas of the stationary states in physical statistics. One of the most important contributions in this field was given by Haken in its theoretical description of the laser dynamics [1]. His results gave the first insights on emergent properties appearing in complex systems due to a cooperative behavior of driving and dissipative forces acting over them. All these ideas became the fundamental principals of the theory of synergetics created by Haken himself [2]. Open quantum chaotic systems are systems subject to these two mechanisms. Although quantum chaotic systems have been firstly studied in the context of environmental systems [3–5], their interaction with other degrees of freedom acting as a finite temperature reservoir will be inevitable. In this sense, Gorin *et al.* [6] have studied the dynamics of a qubit in contact to a near chaotic environment based on random matrix ensemble which in turn, is coupled to a heat bath considered as a far environment affecting the qubit through the chaotic environment. For this tripartite type of system, they have found a recovery in the purity of the qubit when the coupling of the chaotic environment to the heat bath was increased. This is a counterintuitive effect that may be related to the cooperative mechanisms of dissipation and driving forces giving rise to emergent properties in the near environment that decouples the interaction of the qubit with the near environment. Additionally, there has been some recent developments concerning the thermodynamical properties of non-equilibrium quantum systems [7, 8] and in particularly for quantum kicked systems in contact with a thermal reservoir [9, 10] where the non-equilibrium dynamics are introduced with the help of time-dependent periodic delta-kicked potentials [11–13]. In this sense, the freedom to choose strong or weak interactions with the kicks and with the environment, have open up new interesting features on the the emergent thermodynamical properties of the non-equilibrium stationary states or "quasi stationary" states reached by the system in the long time limit. This quasi stationary condition is reached when the system asymptotically gets rid of its dependence on the initial conditions and enters into a limit cycle dynamics where the amount of energy received by a single kick equals the amount of energy dissipated into the environment between two consecutive kicks. At the quasi stationary condition, all the features related to the kicked systems like resonances, anti-resonances or localization [11–17] disappear, and only the strength of the kicks and the period of the kicks become the relevant quantities in the formation of the quasi-steady states. At this regime, the observables are obtained by averaging the desired quantities over the fluctuations that appear in the system as a consequence of the kicks. In this paper we want to report the formation of a quasi stationary states in a liner chain made of nuclear spins which has been a model of certain types of quantum computer devices using nuclear magnetic resonance techniques [18, 19]. Contrary to the kicked harmonic oscillator or the kicked rotator [9, 10] where one can indefinitely populate states by the application of kicks since these systems possess an unbounded spectrum, for the linear chain, one has a finite dimensional system depending on the number of qubits N in the linear chain, ($\dim\mathcal{H} = 2^N$) and one cannot indefinitely populate states by the application of the kicks, thus the formation of the quasi-steady states has to be in general a quite different situation.

We will also focus our attention on how the transition to the quasi stationary regime depends on which of the

qubits in the linear chain are kicked, and the dependence on the parameters chosen for the kicks; in part because of the similarities of our model to that reported in the quantum bang-bang control mechanisms and dynamical decoupling [20–25], where the loss of coherences is suppressed by disrupting the environmental interaction with the use of successive applications of kicks to a qubit. The implications of the dynamical decoupling ideas into the quantum computation fields are by all means very important and part of the aims of this paper is to report the differences between the dynamical decoupling and the formation of quasi-steady states in a quantum computer model.

This paper is organized as follows: In section II we describe the model of the linear chain subject to kicks and in contact with a thermal bath. We also present an approximation of a master equation for the model of the linear chain in contact with this thermal bath. In section III we set the model to 3 qubits and establish the parameter regime we will be working with. In section III A we present the results of our simulations for kicks applied to single qubits on the linear chain and in section III B we present the case where the kicks are done in a alternate manner to two of the qubits of the linear chain. Finally in section IV we give a summary of our results and at the appendix A we present the derivation of the master equation for this model.

II. THE MODEL

The linear chain of spins of one half or qubits we want to study relies on a quantum computer model based on an array of nuclear paramagnetic atoms interacting with a circular polarized RF magnetic field [18, 19, 26–28]. The model consist of a linear chain of N spins with second order Ising type of interaction between the spins, interacting with an external magnetic field described by $\mathbf{B}(z,t) = (b\cos\omega t, b\sin\omega t, B(z))$, with b and ω being the amplitude and the angular frequency of the magnetic field and $B(z)$ is a position dependent amplitude of the z component of the magnetic field. In this model, by setting the angular frequency of the RF-field as the transition frequency of two levels in the linear chain and by choosing a proper time duration of the pulse, one can generate Rabi transitions (π-pulses) and therefore, implement quantum gates on the linear chain. The Hamiltonian of the ideal insulated system of a linear chain is given by:

$$H = -\sum_{l=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{\mu}_l \cdot \mathbf{B}_l - \frac{J}{\hbar}\sum_{l=1}^{N-1} s_l^z s_{l+1}^z - \frac{J'}{\hbar}\sum_{l=1}^{N-2} s_l^z s_{l+2}^z. \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ represent the magnetic moment of the lth-nucleus, which is given in terms of the nuclear spin as $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l = \gamma_o(\hat{s}_l^x, \hat{s}_l^y, \hat{s}_l^z)$, where γ_o is the proton gyromagnetic ratio and $\hat{s}_l^j$ is the jth-component of the spin operator and $\mathbf{B}_l$ represents the magnetic field, valuated at the location of the lth-nuclear spin ($z = z_l$). Also J and J' quantify the coupling to the first and second neighbor interaction between the qubits. The angle between the linear chain and the z-component of the magnetic field is chosen as $\cos\theta = 1/\sqrt{3}$ to eliminate the dipole-dipole interaction between the qubits. The Hamiltonian of the ideal system can be rewritten as: $H = H_s + H_{rf}(t)$, where

$$H_s = -\sum_{l=1}^{N} \omega_l s_l^z - \frac{J}{\hbar}\sum_{l=1}^{N-1} s_l^z s_{l+1}^z - \frac{J'}{\hbar}\sum_{l=1}^{N-2} s_l^z s_{l+2}^z. \quad (2)$$

with ω_l being the Larmor frequencies of each one of the N qubits in the linear chain and

$$H_{rf}(t) = -\frac{\Omega}{2}\sum_{l=1}^{N}\left(e^{-i\omega t}s_l^+ + e^{i\omega t}s_l^-\right) \quad (3)$$

has the time dependent terms corresponding to the interaction of the linear chain with the RF-field. Here $\Omega = \gamma_o b$ is the Rabi frequency.

In this paper we will tackle the case where the RF part of the field is switched off, and only the z-component of the magnetic field is taken into account generating a precession movement of the magnetic moment of the nuclear atoms. This is equivalent to take $\Omega = 0$ in (3) and thus, $H_{rf}(t)$ will be simply not considered. The eigenbasis of the Hamiltonian H_s is named as $\{|\alpha_N \ldots \alpha_1\rangle\}$ for $\alpha_j = 0, 1$ with j labeling the j-th spin in the linear chain. The action of the j-th spin operators in this basis are defined as: $s_j^z|\alpha_j\rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2}(-1)^{\alpha_j}|\alpha_j\rangle$, $s_j^+|\alpha_k\rangle = \hbar\delta_{\alpha_j,0}|1\rangle$, and $s_j^-|\alpha_j\rangle = \hbar\delta_{\alpha_j,1}|0\rangle$. The elements of this basis forms a register of N-qubits with a total number of 2^N registers, which is the dimensionality for the Hilbert space.

In our model, the interaction with the environment plays an important role. We consider the linear chain to be immerse in a dissipative finite temperature thermal environment consisting on a quantized radiation field with an infinite number of radiation modes [27, 29]. The Hamiltonian of the bath can be described in general terms as a large set of harmonic oscillators with the vacuum energy shifted out:

$$H_{env} = \sum_{i}^{\infty} \hbar\omega_i a_i^\dagger a_i, \quad (4)$$

and the interaction Hamiltonian is described through the dipole approximation as:

$$H_{int} = \sum_{i,l}^{\infty,N} g_{il}s_l^+ a_i + g_{ij}^* s_l^- a_i^\dagger, \quad (5)$$

which accounts for exitation-de exitation process in the system through the coupling to the bath of oscillators having characteristic frequencies near the resonant frequencies of the linear chain. The constant g_{ij} is the coupling strength of the spins to the thermal bath and $a_i(a_i^\dagger)$

are the rising (lowering) operators in the number of photons in the bath. For this model of interaction with the environment, we have derived a master equation following the same lines as in [27]. This derivation can be found at the appendix A. An important thing to remark about the model of dissipation is that the super operator in the master equation that describes the non unitary evolution of the system does not has a Lindblad form, nevertheless it describes different rates of dissipation for the different non-equidistant energy levels of $H_{\rm s}$.

The kicks applied to the qubits of the linear chain will be done at fixed instants of time $t_{\rm k}$. They can be understood as a series of instantaneous changes in the wave function performed by successive unitary transformations due to an additional external microwave field [23]. These kicks or pulses represents a series of rotations of the jth-qubit about certain angle. Also, the kicks are assumed to be instantaneous so that during their application no coupling to the bath is considered, see *eg.* [30] for the application of pulses with a finite duration. We use a periodic delta-kicked potential to describe the action of the pulses done to the jth-qubit of the linear chain. This potential has the following form:

$$V_j(t) = \kappa_j s_j^x \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(t - n t_{\rm k}) \,, \tag{6}$$

where κ_j represents the angle of rotation of the qubit about the x-axis. The subindex j labels the spin in the linear chain subject to the kicks and $t_{\rm k}$ is the fixed period of the kicks.

A. Dimensionless model and implementation of the dynamics

The dynamics of the system are described in terms of two alternating autonomous quantum maps. One map describes the dissipative non-unitary dynamics under a master equation which we present hereafter, and the second map is the unitary transformation produced by the kicks, which accounts for an instantaneous change in the wave function. We will use a dimensionless description of the dynamics through the Pauli matrices representation of spins: $\vec{\sigma}_j = 2\vec{s}_j/\hbar$ for each of the spins in the linear chain. Also we want to measure everything in terms of an dimensionless time scale, therefore we choose the spin of the chain that has the largest Larmor frequency to measure our time scale in terms of the period of the Larmor precession of this spin by defining: $\tau = \omega_A t$, for $\omega_A = \max_{j=1,\dots N} \omega_j$. By redefining the quantities described above and considering the case of no RF-field, we write the master equation as:

$$\mathrm{i}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\tau}\varrho_{\rm s} = [H_{\rm s}, \varrho_{\rm s}] + \mathrm{i}\mathcal{D}[\varrho_{\rm s}] \tag{7}$$

where in the dimensionless units, $H_{\rm s}$ takes the form:

$$H_{\rm s} = -\frac{1}{2}\sigma_A^z - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{N-1}\delta_j\sigma_j^z - \frac{\chi}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{N-1}\sigma_j^z\sigma_{j+1}^z - \frac{\chi'}{4}\sum_{j=1}^{N-2}\sigma_j^z\sigma_{j+2}^z \tag{8}$$

with $\delta_j = \omega_j/\omega_A < 1$, $\chi = J/\omega_A$ and $\chi' = J'/\omega_A$, and the term that accounts for the dissipative behavior due to the interaction with the thermal bath has the form (see appendix A):

$$\mathcal{D}[\varrho_{\rm s}] = -\sum_{l=1}^{N}\beta_l\left\{\left[\hat{\gamma}_l^{(1)}(D)\,\sigma_l^+, \sigma_l^-\,\varrho_{\rm s}\right] + \left[\varrho_{\rm s}\sigma_l^+, \sigma_l^-\,\hat{\gamma}_l^{(1)}(D)\right] + \left[\hat{\gamma}_l^{(2)}(D)\,\sigma_l^-, \sigma_l^+\varrho_{\rm s}\right] + \left[\varrho_{\rm s}\sigma_l^-, \sigma_l^+\,\hat{\gamma}_l^{(2)}(D)\right]\right\} \tag{9}$$

where $\beta_l = \gamma_l/4\omega_A$ with γ_l is a parameter that accounts for the strength of coupling to the environment (see appendix A), and $D = k_B T/\omega_A\hbar$ is a dimensionless description of the temperature of the bath. Also the resonant frequency operator $\hat{\Omega}_j$ defined in (A3) becomes $\hat{\Omega}_j = \omega_j + \frac{J}{2}(\sigma_{j+1}^z + \sigma_{j-1}^z) + \frac{J'}{2}(\sigma_{j+2}^z + \sigma_{j-2}^z)$ and the term H_{LS} that appears in (A14) which produces a global shift in the energy spectrum has been neglected. The zero temperature limit is assumed when the temperature of the bath is sufficiently small compared to the transition energies of the linear chain. Then one makes $D \to 0$, and the temperature dependent operators become: $\hat{\gamma}_l^{(1)}(D \to 0) \to \hat{\Omega}_l^3$ and $\hat{\gamma}_l^{(2)}(D \to 0) \to 0$. In this limit, the dissipative term of the master equation describes a pure spontaneous emission process.

Finally, the instantaneous changes of the wave function due to the kicks happens after the system has evolved a certain period of time $\tau_{\rm k} = \omega_A t_{\rm k}$ being only in contact with the heat bath. A kick done to the jth-spin means to apply a rotation of this spin by an angle κ. This unitary transformation can be represented by the unitary operator:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{x,n}^\dagger(\kappa_n) &= \mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\kappa_n\sigma_n^x/2} \\ &= \cos\kappa_n/2 + \mathrm{i}\sigma_n^x\sin\kappa_n/2 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

such that if $\varrho_{\rm s}(\tau_{\rm k})$ is the solution of the master equation (7), then the application of the kick will be represented by the unitary transformation of the system: $R_{x,j}^\dagger(\kappa_j)\varrho_{\rm s}(t_{\rm k})R_{x,j}(\kappa_j)$. After the first kick, a new configuration of the states of the system will appear as the result of the kick and the system will evolve again non-unitarily in contact with the heat bath until the next kick happens when the system has evolved a new equally interval of time $\tau_{\rm k}$, ($\tau = 2\tau_{\rm k}$), and this process repeats several times until a quasi stationary condition is reached. In the following, we study the case of a linear chain made of 3 qubits.

III. LINEAR CHAIN MADE OF 3 QUBITS

In this section we consider a linear chain consisting of only three qubits, $N = 3$, and assume the finite temperature and the zero temperature limits of the environment. The dimension of the Hilbert space in this case is $2^3 = 8$ and we label the qubits as A, B and C. The states of the linear chain form a register defined by $|ABC\rangle$ with $A, B, C = 0, 1$, and we use a decimal notation to represent to the different states of the system: $|1\rangle = |000\rangle$, $|2\rangle = |001\rangle$, $|3\rangle = |010\rangle$, $|4\rangle = |011\rangle$, $|5\rangle = |100\rangle$, $|6\rangle = |101\rangle$, $|7\rangle = |110\rangle$ and $|8\rangle = |111\rangle$. We also assume that the three different qubits are equally coupled to the thermal bath at a definite value β.

1. *Parameters*

We set the following order of the Larmor frequencies of the qubits and Ising interaction constants as: $\omega_A > \omega_B > \omega_C > J > J'$, and choose their values together such that they provide a non-degenerate energy spectrum since it makes easier to analyze the results. In the dimensionless notation, these choices corresponds to: $\chi' < \chi < \delta_C < \delta_B < 1$, thus we set for this parameters the following values: $\delta_B = 0.5$, $\delta_C = 0.25$, $\chi = 0.15$ and $\chi' = 0.1$. The values of κ_j represent the angle of rotation of the kicked qubit and they must lie between 0 and 2π. The later represents a full rotation of the qubit and for this angle and $\kappa_j = 0$, the kicks will not have any effect on the linear chain. In our opinion, the most interesting angle to chose is $\kappa_j = \pi/2$, since this angle will have the effect of to instantaneously change the state of a single qubit into a superposition of the states of this qubit, *eg.* if the kicked qubit is initially found at certain state, lets say $|\psi\rangle_n = |0\rangle_n$ then the application of a kick to it will yield: $R^{\dagger}_{x,n}(\pi/2)|0\rangle_n = 1/\sqrt{2}(|0\rangle_n + \mathrm{i}|1\rangle_n)$. We will set the period of the kicks to be commensurable with the period of the qubit A which has the highest of the Larmor frequencies. In the dimensionless description, the choices we do for the period of the kicks are $\tau_k = 2\pi/q$ where q is a positive number different than zero and which we will vary to obtain different results. Finally we set the parameters of the bath to $\beta = 0.1$ and we set the dimensionless temperature parameter to $D = 1$ for the finite temperature limit and $D = 0$ for the zero temperature limit. In our simulations we take the excited state of the linear chain as the initial condition of the system: $|\psi\rangle = |111\rangle = |8\rangle$.

A. kicks done to a single qubit

We begin by showing comparison of the transient dynamics of the system when kicks are applied to a single qubit, to the transients dynamics when no kicks are applied and only the bath acts on the system. This is shown in figure 1 and figure 2 where the diagonal elements of the density matrix are depicted for the finite temperature and zero temperature limits respectively. When no kicks are applied, the finite temperature limit yield stationary states on the system corresponding to a Gibbs distribution of states and for the zero temperature limit the system reaches the ground state as a spontaneous emission process takes place. When kicks are applied to a single qubit, the system reaches a quasi stationary condition which is characterized by fluctuations around a certain averaged value. These fluctuations are seen in the figure as discontinuities happening at the moment when a kick is done. One interesting feature about the quasi stationary condition is the appearance of a certain degree of superposition between some of the states in the system which is a consequence of having a rotation angle



FIG. 1. The figures shows the diagonal elements of the density matrix for: $\delta_B = 0.5$, $\delta_C = 0.25$, $\chi = 0.15$, $\chi' = 0.1$ at the finite temperature limit whit $D = 1$ and $\beta = 0.1$ and when periodic kicks are applied to each qubit, using a kick strength of $\kappa = \pi/2$ and a period of the kicks $\tau_k = \pi$.



FIG. 2. The figures shows the diagonal elements of the density matrix for: $\delta_B = 0.5$, $\delta_C = 0.25$, $\chi = 0.15$, $\chi' = 0.1$ at the zero temperature limit whit $D = 0$ and $\beta = 0.1$ and when periodic kicks are applied to each qubit, using a kick strength of $\kappa = \pi/2$ and a period of the kicks $\tau_k = \pi$.

of $\kappa = \pi/2$. The fact can be deduced by the shortened distance between the diagonal elements associated to the transitions of the kicked qubit *eg.* for kicks done to qubit A, and according to our definition of the quantum register defined as $|ABC\rangle$, the states $|0BC\rangle$ lies closer to the state $|1BC\rangle$, for $B, C = 0, 1$, this is, according to our definition of the natural basis, the diagonal element ϱ_{11} lies closer to the diagonal element ϱ_{55}, the diagonal element ϱ_{22} lies closer to the diagonal element ϱ_{66} and so on. For kicks done to the qubit B, and qubit C happens the same but now the superposition is created between states corresponding to the transitions of the qubit B and C respectively. This superposition is probably more noticeable at the zero temperature limit, fig. 2; since in this case the effect of the bath is to drive the system to the ground state and due to the kicks, the ground state pulls up the state corresponding to the superposition while the ground state is dragged down.

The coherent terms related to these superpositions are non-zero as can notice from figure 3 where the absolute value of the density matrix elements of are depicted at a stage of evolution where the quasi stationary condition has already been reached and a new kick was about to happen. This superposition appearing in the system is in fact resilient to the environment as they are the result of both mechanism of dissipation and kicks acting together over the linear chain.



FIG. 3. The figure shows the matrix elements of the matrix density for periodic kicks to qubit C B and A just before a kick is done, already a the quasi stationary condition of the linear chain. The parameters of the kicks used are: $\kappa = \pi/2$, ($\pi/2$-pulses), $\tau_{\rm k} = \pi$, the system parameters are $\delta_B = 0.5$, $\delta_C = 0.25$, $\chi = 0.15$, $\chi' = 0.1$ and $\beta = 0.1$. The first second and third show the cases when qubit C, qubit B and qubit A have been kicked respectively while the rows show the finite temperature case ($D = 1$), and the zero temperature limit case ($D = 0$).

One way to define when the system has reached the quasi stationary condition is by looking at the energy of the linear chain, $E(\tau) = \langle H_{\rm s}\rangle$ at the time τ. In the long time limit, the quasi stationary condition is reached when the amount of energy dissipated to the environment between two consecutive kicks equals the amount of energy received by the individual kicks. This can be seen in the figure 4 where the energy of the linear chain is plotted as a function of the number of kicks. In it, each upper peak represents the energy of the system just after a kick has happen and the lower peaks represents the energy just before a kick is about to happen. The energy of the system when no kicks are applied is also plotted in figure 4 in the squared marked black lines. In these cases, the energy at the stationary regime for the finite temperature corresponds to the energy of a mixture of states and for the zero temperature limit, the energy corresponds to the ground state energy. By using the definition of the



FIG. 4. The figure shows the energy of the linear chain for the cases when: (no kicks) only the bath acts on the system, (q_A) the bath and periodic kicks are applied to qubit A, (q_B) the bath and periodic kicks are applied to qubit B and (q_C) the bath and periodic kicks are applied to qubit C. The figure shows the finite temperature limit of the bath at the first column and the zero temperature limit at the second column. The parameters used are $\kappa = \pi/2$, $\tau_{\rm k} = \pi$, $\delta_B = 0.5$, $\delta_C = 0.25$, $\chi = 0.15$, $\chi' = 0.1$ and $\beta = 0.1$.

energy flux to the environment between two consecutive kicks as described in [9, 10]:

$$\delta Q = E(\tau_n^+) - E(\tau_{n+1}^-) \tag{11}$$

where $\tau_n^+ = \lim_{\delta\to 0} n\tau_{\rm k} + \delta$ and $\tau_n^- = \lim_{\delta\to 0} n\tau_{\rm k} - \delta$ represents respectively the time immediately after and immediately before the n-th kick has happen, then one also can say that the quasi-steady condition is reached when δQ becomes constant between any two consecutive kicks. Perhaps a more convenient way to analyze the energies of the quasi-steady states is by defining the average energy at the quasi stationary regime in the following way:

$$\bar{E}_{\rm qst} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{E(\tau_n^+) + E(\tau_n^-)}{2} \tag{12}$$

These average energies are also depicted in figure 4 as the dashed lines. The average energy of the system and the time to reach the quasi stationary condition depends on which of the qubits of the linear chain is kicked which are only characterized from their Larmor frequencies. As the

average energy is increased for qubits with higher Larmor frequencies, also does the amount of energy dissipated to the environment δQ, as one can notice from the figure 4. Now we turn our attention back to the superposition of the states at the quasi stationary regime. We have found that the distance between states and the magnitude of the coherent terms depends on the period of the kicks. For showing this we first define the average probability distance between states at the quasi stationary regime as:

$$\bar{d}_{i\to j} = |\bar{P}_i - \bar{P}_j|, \tag{13}$$

where $\bar{P}_i$ is the average of the probability of the ith state of the linear chain defined as:

$$\bar{P}_i = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\varrho_{ii}(\tau_n^+) + \varrho_{ii}(\tau_n^-)}{2}, \tag{14}$$

In figure 5 at the right, we show the average probability distance between the ground state ($|1\rangle$) and the states corresponding to the superpositions created by the kicks, (state $|5\rangle$ for qubit A, state $|3\rangle$ for qubit B and state $|2\rangle$ for qubit C), as function of the period of the kicks, and at the right, the absolute value of coherent terms of these states are depicted also as function of the period of the kicks. The finite temperature limit in the continuous line and and the zero temperature limits in the dashed lines and both figures show a range of variation of periods of the kicks from $\tau_k = \pi/50$ to $\tau_k = 4\pi$. As the period



FIG. 5. At the right figure is depicted the average probability distance as defined in (13) as function of the period of the kicks. The average probability distance is depicted between the ground state to the states: $|5\rangle$ in the case of kicks to qubit A (q_A), $|3\rangle$ in the case of kicks to qubit B (q_B) and $|2\rangle$ in the case of kicks to qubit C (q_C). At the left, the absolute value of the non-diagonal elements: $|\varrho_{15}|$ for kicks done to qubit A, (q_A), $|\varrho_{13}|$ for kicks done to qubit B, (q_B) and $|\varrho_{12}|$ for kicks done to qubit C, (q_C), are depicted at the quasi stationary regime as function of the period of the kick. The parameters used for the simulations were: $\kappa = \pi/2$, $\delta_B = 0.5$, $\delta_C = 0.25$, $\chi = 0.15$, $\chi' = 0.1$, $\beta = 0.1$ and $D = 1$ for the continuous lines and $D = 0$ for the dashed lines.

of the kicks is reduced (going from the right to the left in the figure), the average probability distance increases and decreases a few times before it finally drops down to zero after the last maximum which we have named



FIG. 6. At the right, the dependence of the average energy at the quasi stationary regime $\bar{E}_{\rm qst}$ to the period of the kick is depicted for the cases when kicks are applied to qubit A (q_A), qubit B (q_B) and qubit C (q_C). At the left, the figure shows how the energy flux per period of the kick $\delta Q/\tau_k$ depends on the period of the kick at the quasi stationary regime. The parameters used for the simulations were: $\kappa = \pi/2$, (π/2-pulses) and the system parameters, $\delta_B = 0.5$, $\delta_C = 0.25$, $\chi = 0.15$, $\chi' = 0.1$, $\beta = 0.1$ and $D = 1$ for the continuous lines and $D = 0$ for the dashed lines.

the fast kicking regime which depends on the qubit that has been kicked. The oscillatory behavior seems to be a general feature although, the different curves seems to have a different scale with respect to the period of the kicks. This is related to the Larmor frequencies of the qubits since for smaller frequencies, the period of precession of the qubit around the magnetic field increases, and therefore more kicks are applied per period than for qubits with a larger Larmor frequencies. This in turn makes the qubits with smaller frequencies to achieve the fast kicking regimes earlier. The absolute value of the coherences also present these oscillations with the maximums and minimums at the same values of the period of the kicks as for the average distance between the states. However, the coherences never drops down to zero at the fast kicking regime and thus, at the limit of fast kicks the quasi-steady states corresponds to a maximum superposition between the states.

In figure 6 we have plotted the dependence on the period of the kicks of the average energy $\bar{E}_{\rm qst}$ and the energy flux per period of the kick, $\delta Q/\tau_k$ at the quasi stationary regime. As before the continuous lines corresponds to the finite temperature limit and the dashed lines to the zero temperature limit. This figure shows also that the average energy and the energy flux increases and decreases as the period of the kicks is reduced meaning that the system passes through resonant and non-resonant regions. The former corresponds to a decrement in the average distance and coherences while the later corresponds to the contrary. The maximum average energy reached by the linear chain happens in the limit of fast kicking where the maximum superposition is theorized. It is also interesting that as the period of the kicks is reduced, the average energy and the energy flux seems to maintain a linear relation in the sense that when the average energy increases, also does the dissipated energy and vice versa.

We believe that at the fast kicking regime, this condition has to do with a Fourier law as it was observed in [9, 10]. Viola *et al.*in [20, 21] describe a dynamical decoupling phenomenon due to a Zeno effect when a qubit which is subject to the influence of an environment is repeatedly kicked such that the decoherence on the qubit is disrupted in the limit of continuous kicking, in fact, every interaction in the system may be disrupted on the qubit in the fast kicking regime [24]. A similar effect happens in our model when we look at the quasi stationary regime, how does the amount of energy dissipated to the environment in between two consecutive kicks, δQ, depends on the period of the kicks as shown in figure 7. In the figure one notices that the amount of energy dissipated drops down to zero as the periods of the kick becomes smaller than $\pi/2$. Nevertheless we cannot say



FIG. 7. The figure shows how the energy flux δQ depends on the period of the kick at the quasi stationary regime. The parameters used for the simulations were: $\kappa = \pi/2$, (π/2-pulses) and the system parameters, $\delta_B = 0.5$, $\delta_C = 0.25$, $\chi = 0.15$, $\chi' = 0.1$, $\beta = 0.1$ and $D = 1$ for the continuous lines and $D = 0$ for the dashed lines.

that this corresponds to a truly dynamical decoupling effect since as we have seen before; the system reaches and stays at the quasi stationary condition due to the joint mechanisms of kicks and bath, and the form of the quasi-steady state differs very much to that of the initial conditions, in fact, the form of the quasi-steady state corresponds more to the ground state of the system with an additional potential coming from the kicks. Also, the amount of energy dissipated per period of the kick at the fast kicking regime, is a non-zero finite quantity which increases as the average energy at the quasi-steady state increases, as one can sees from figure 6. These contradictory effects to the dynamical decoupling may have a simple answer when one pays attention to the amount of energy dissipated between kicks. This amount needs to converge to zero, in order for the average energy of the quasi-steady state and the amount of energy dissipated per period of the kicks to have a finite value, this is, if: $\lim_{\tau_k \to 0} \delta Q/\tau_k \to$ CST then $\lim_{\tau_k \to 0} \delta Q \to 0$ as $\tau_k \to 0$, but if one looks to the dissipated energy in this limit alone, ($\delta Q \to 0$), this may give a wrong idea of having a suppression of the interaction with the environment.

B. Alternate kicks done to two different qubits

We now tackle the situation when alternate kicks are done to two of the qubits. By alternate kicks we mean that one of the qubits is kicked at once and the next kick will be done to another qubit and the following kick will be done back again to the qubit that was kicked in the first place and so on. The quasi-steady states are reached in the system in similar conditions as before, but now the quasi-steady condition is reached when the total amount of energy received in the system due to two consecutive alternate kicks equals the amount of energy dissipated to the environment before the next couple of alternate kicks happens. On the other hand the form of the quasi-steady states reached by the system are quite different from those reached by single kicks. In figure 8 the matrix elements of the density matrix are depicted for the finite temperature and the zero temperature limit. At the first column the alternate kicks are done between qubits A and B, in the second column between qubits A and C and in the third column between qubits B and C. In



FIG. 8. The figure shows the matrix elements of the matrix density for periodic kicks to qubit A and B, A and C and B and C just before a kick is done to the qubit with the smaller Larmor frequency of the two qubits, and already a the quasi stationary condition. The parameters of the kicks used are: $\kappa = \pi/2$, (π/2-pulses), $\tau_k = \pi$, the system parameters are $\delta_B = 0.5$, $\delta_C = 0.25$, $\chi = 0.15$, $\chi' = 0.1$ and $\beta = 0.1$.. The different rows show the finite temperature case ($D = 1$), and the zero temperature limit case ($D = 0$).

the figures one can notice the appearance of additional superpositions which are not consequence of the direct kicks to the qubits but rather an indirect consequence of the alternate kicks, *eg.* the coherent term ϱ_{17} in the figure for kicks done to qubit A and B (top left figure), appears as a result of kicks done to qubit B when already a superposition between states $|1\rangle$ and $|5\rangle$ is in the system due to applications of kicks to qubit A. This new

superposed states seems to have a certain degree of entanglement resilient to the environment as the formation of these states are a consequence of the cooperative effect of the dissipation and kicks. For measuring the degree of entanglement we make use of the bipartite concurrence, see *eg.* [31];

$$\mathcal{C}_{i(jk)} = \sqrt{2 - 2\mathrm{tr}\,\varrho_i^2} \tag{15}$$

where ϱ_i is the reduced system when tracing out the two other qubits. For pure states the bipartite concurrence is zero while for entangled states, $\mathcal{C}_{i(jk)} > 0$, and getting the value of one for a maximally entangled state. This concurrence will measure the degree of entanglement of a single qubit to the rest of the linear chain. Nevertheless in the finite temperature limit one must distinguish the contribution to the concurrence coming from the classical probabilistic correlations which appear as consequence of the coupling to the finite temperature bath to those really coming from the entanglement between one of the qubits with the rest of the linear chain. Naturally, this won't be the case at the zero temperature limit since now the bath drives the system into a pure state. For distinguishing between the contributions of a mixed state and entangled states one must use the concurrence of mixed states defined as the convex roof of $\mathcal{C}(\varrho) = \min \sum_i p_i c(|\psi_i\rangle)$, with $\varrho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\psi_i|$, $p_i \geq 0$, for all possible decompositions into pure states $|\psi_i\rangle$ [32]. Nevertheless, we won't be distinguishing between both contributions and use only the definition of the bipartite concurrence, Eq. (15) as function of the period of the kicks since the dependence of the concurrence on the period of the kicks may be an indicator of entanglement due to the kicks produced in the system. In figure 9 we have plotted the bipartite concurrence as function of the period of the kicks when alternate kicks are done to two qubits of the linear chain. The state of the system is obtained by taking the average of the density matrix at the quasi stationary regime. Figure 9 shows the finite temperature and the zero temperature limits. At the finite temperature limit we see some curves which vary as function of the period of the kicks while some other have a more steady value with respect to the period of the kicks. The curves corresponding to the concurrence of the kicked qubits seems to have a stronger dependence on the period of the kicks and we believe there is a certain degree of entanglement among them. Additionally for the fast kicking regimes, these curves converge to the maximum value while the non-kicked qubit remains at a steady value which happens mostly due to the concurrence of the mixed state. A completely different situation is observed at the zero temperature limit where the concurrence of the mixed state is not a problem and the two kicked qubits clearly presets non-classical correlations. The maximum entanglement happens simultaneously for both qubits at the fast kicking regime.



FIG. 9. The figure shows the bipartite concurrence of qubit A and B and C as function of the period of the kicks at the quasi stationary regime of the system for the finite temperature and the zero temperature limit, with $\kappa = \pi/2$ and $\delta_B = 0.5$, $\delta_C = 0.25$, $\chi = 0.15$, $\chi' = 0.1$ and $\beta = 0.1$.

IV. SUMMARY

We have described the quasi stationary condition of a linear chain made of qubits subject to periodic kicks and dissipation. The linear chain we have used has been a theoretical model for a certain type of quantum computing models. Our aim by using this model of the linear chain has been to provide certain insights and features that may help to implement a theoretical protocol of reduction of decoherence in such quantum devices. For doing our study we have derived a master equation for the model in which the degree of interaction to the environment depends on the energy of the different states of the linear chain. This model of dissipation leads to a stationary condition which corresponds to a Gibbs distribution at the finite temperature limit and to the ground state at the zero temperature limit which are the limits one would expect. We have described the conditions and the attributes of the of the non-equilibrium stationary states reached by the system when periodic delta kicks are applied to the qubits under different situations like single kicked qubits and alternates kicks to the qubits. In the case of single kicked qubits, we have found an endurable condition of the system to remain in a superposition state regardless of the effects of the bath since the bath itself has a crucial role in the formation of these states. We have explored different regimes of periods of the kicks finding resonant periods of the kicks for which the degree of super position and the average energy of the system increases and finding maximum values in the fast kicking regimes and we have discussed briefly the connection of what we observed for the quasi stationary states to the phenomenon of dynamical decoupling. We have also study the case where alternate kicks were done to two pair of qubits in the linear chain for which the system reaches a quasi stationary condition with a certain degree of entanglement between the two kicked qubits

finding a maximum degree of entanglement in the limit of fast kicks.

Appendix A: Derivation of a master equation

In [26] a derivation of a master equation for a linear chain of three nuclear spins system with second neighbor Ising interaction between them has been done and similar lines of derivation of a master equation has been done for the quantum planar rotor in [10]. In both cases, the energy spectrum of the system has a non-equidistant spectrum and are coupled to the environment through creation and annihilation operators producing spontaneous emission and thermally induced processes. Here we follow similar lines of the derivation of both cases to derive the master equation that will account for our model. This master equation is not in a Lindblad form but rather it is derived by Redfield approximations which we consider to work better for the description of the spontaneous emission and thermally induced process on a system with an non-equidistant spectrum. We start by writing the full Hamiltonian of the composite in the form $H(t) = H_{\rm c} + W_{\rm int}(t)$ with $H_{\rm c} = H_{\rm s} + H_{\rm env}$ and $W_{\rm int}(t) = H_{\rm rf}(t) + H_{\rm int}$. The dynamical equation of the reduced density matrix for the spin chain system with an initially decoupled state of the system-environment, $\varrho = \varrho_{\rm s} \otimes \sigma_{\rm env}$, in the interaction picture with respect to $H_{\rm c}$, and under the Born-Markov limit [**?** **?**] can be written in the following form:

$$\frac{{\rm d}\tilde{\varrho}_{\rm s}(t)}{{\rm d}t} = \frac{1}{{\rm i}\hbar}[\tilde{H}_{\rm rf}(t), \tilde{\varrho}_{\rm s}(t)] - \frac{1}{\hbar^2}\int_0^\infty {\rm d}\tau {\rm Tr}_{\rm e}[\tilde{H}_{\rm int}(t), [\tilde{H}_{\rm int}(t-\tau), \tilde{\varrho}_{\rm s}(t) \otimes \sigma_{\rm e}]]. \quad \text{(A1)}$$

The operators $\tilde{s}_j^{\pm}$ for $j = 1, ..., N$, in the interaction picture have the form:

$$\tilde{s}_j^{\pm}(t) = s_j^{\pm} e^{\pm i\hat{\Omega}_j t}, \quad \text{(A2)}$$

where

$$\hat{\Omega}_j = \omega_j + \frac{J}{\hbar}(s_{j+1}^z + s_{j-1}^z) + \frac{J'}{\hbar}(s_{j+2}^z + s_{j-2}^z), \quad \text{(A3)}$$

is an frequency operator that commutes with the Hamiltonian $H_{\rm s}$ and whose eigenvalues are the transition frequencies of the different states. The interaction Hamiltonian between the spin chain and the environment is represented by a coupling between the polarization operator and a Bosonic modes operators. Since the baths are supposed to be in a stationary Boltzmann states: $\sigma_{\rm e} = \prod_k \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \sum_{n_k} {\rm e}^{-E_{n_k}/k_B T} |n_k\rangle\langle n_k|$, any perturbation thermalizes immediately and also the and also the self correlation functions of the baths are null: $\langle \hat{a}_i^\dagger(s)\hat{a}_k^\dagger(t)\rangle = \langle \hat{a}_i(s)\hat{a}_k(t)\rangle = 0$. The bath correlation functions appearing in (A1) have the following form:

$$\sum_{i,k} g_{ij} g_{kl}^* \mathcal{C}_{ik}(\tau) = \sum_i |g|_{ijl}^2 {\rm e}^{-{\rm i}\omega_i \tau} \left(N(\omega_i) + 1\right) \quad \text{(A4)}$$

$$\sum_{i,k} g_{ij}^* g_{kl} \mathcal{C}_{ik}^*(\tau) = \sum_i |g|_{ijl}^2 {\rm e}^{i\omega_i \tau} N(\omega_i), \quad \text{(A5)}$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{ik}(\tau) = \langle a_i(\tau) a_k^\dagger \rangle$, $\mathcal{C}_{ik}(\tau)^* = \langle a_i^\dagger(\tau) a_k \rangle$ and $N(\omega_i) = \left({\rm e}^{\omega_i \hbar/k_B T} - 1\right)^{-1}$ are the Planck's distribution function. We assume the sum over i is dense (there are an uncountable number of radiation modes) and the continuous limit can be taken. The number of characteristic frequencies with wave vector components $\vec{f}$ in the interval ${\rm d}f_x {\rm d}f_y {\rm d}f_z$ in the volume V is given by $V 4\pi f^2 {\rm d}f/(2\pi)^3 = V\omega^2 {\rm d}\omega/\pi^2 c^3$, where $f = c \cdot \omega$. Thus the sum in the correlation functions can be changed by an integration over the frequencies with the proper weight factor,

$$\sum_{i,k} g_{ij} g_{kl}^* \mathcal{C}_{ik}(\tau) = \frac{\gamma_{jl}}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} {\rm d}\omega\, \omega^3 (N(\omega) + 1) e^{-{\rm i}\omega\tau} \quad \text{(A6)}$$

$$\sum_{i,k} g_{ij}^* g_{kl} \mathcal{C}_{ik}^*(\tau) = \frac{\gamma_{jl}}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} {\rm d}\omega\, \omega^3 N(\omega) e^{{\rm i}\omega\tau} \quad \text{(A7)}$$

where $\gamma_{jl} = V|g|_{jl}^2/\pi c^3$. The correlation functions becomes the Fourier transform of a spectral density associated to the continuous modes in the thermal bath and we have assumed a linearly dependence on the characteristic frequencies of the radiation modes, $|g|_{ijl}^2 = |g|_{jl}^2 \omega_i$. By writing eq.(A1) back in the Schrödingers picture and using (A6) and (A7), we write for the master equation:

$$\frac{{\rm d}\varrho_{\rm s}(t)}{{\rm d}t} = \frac{1}{{\rm i}\hbar}[H_{\rm s} + H_{\rm rf}(t), \varrho_{\rm s}] - \frac{1}{\hbar^2}\sum_{j,l=1}^{N} \frac{\gamma_{jl}}{\pi} \int_0^\infty {\rm d}\tau \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} {\rm d}\omega\, \omega^3\, \mathcal{R}_{j,l}(\omega, \tau)[\varrho_{\rm s}] \quad \text{(A8)}$$

where the super operator $\mathcal{R}_{j,l}(\omega,\tau)[\varrho_{\rm s}]$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_{j,l}(\omega,\tau)[\varrho_{\rm s}] = (N(\omega)+1)\, {\rm e}^{-{\rm i}(\omega - \hat{\Omega}_l)\tau} {\rm D}_1[\varrho_{\rm s}] + N(\omega) {\rm e}^{{\rm i}(\omega - \hat{\Omega}_l)\tau} {\rm D}_2[\varrho_{\rm s}] + h.c. \quad \text{(A9)}$$

with ${\rm D}_1[\varrho_{\rm s}] = s_j^+ s_l^- \varrho_{\rm s} - s_l^- \varrho_{\rm s} s_j^+$ and ${\rm D}_2[\varrho_{\rm s}] = s_j^- s_l^+ \varrho_{\rm s} - s_l^+ \varrho_{\rm s} s_j^-$. Now we can exchange the order of integration in (A8) and evaluate the integrals by introducing a full eigenbasis of $H_{\rm s}$, lets say $\mathbb{1} = \sum_m |m\rangle\langle m|$ and call Ω_{lm} as the eigenvalues of the operator $\hat{\Omega}_l$, $(\hat{\Omega}_l |m\rangle = \Omega_{lm}|m\rangle)$, for the jth spin. For the τ integration we can separate the real and the imaginary part by using the known relation $\int_0^\infty {\rm d}\tau {\rm e}^{\pm {\rm i}\epsilon\tau} = \pi\delta(\epsilon) \mp {\rm i}\mathbf{P}/\epsilon$, where $\mathbf{P}$ is the Cauchy's principal value. For the real part, integration over τ will yield delta functions of the form $\delta(\omega - \Omega_{lm})$. Consequently, integration over ω will yield : $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} {\rm d}\omega\, \delta(\omega - \Omega_{lm})\, \omega^3 N(\omega) = \Omega_l^3 N(\Omega_{lm})$. This real part is responsible of the no unitary dynamics of the system yielding the dissipative processes and thermalization

processes. On the other hand the imaginary part contain some non physical contributions to the dynamics that can be solved if we neglect a small term under the assumption of $\omega_l \gg J(J')\hbar$ and additionally assume the secular approximation which is equivalent to consider $\gamma_{ij} = \gamma_i \delta_{ij}$. With this assumptions the imaginary term can be incorporated to the von Neumann dynamics. By recovering the identity we write for the master equation:

$$\mathrm{i}\hbar \frac{\mathrm{d}\varrho_{\mathrm{s}}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = [H_{\mathrm{s}} + H_{\mathrm{rf}}(t) + H_{LS}, \varrho_{\mathrm{s}}] + \frac{\mathrm{i}}{\hbar}\mathcal{D}[\varrho_{\mathrm{s}}]$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}[\varrho_{\mathrm{s}}] = -\sum_{l=1}^{N} \Big(\Big[\hat{\gamma}_l^{(1)}(T)\, s_l^+, s_l^- \varrho_{\mathrm{s}} \Big] + \Big[\varrho_{\mathrm{s}} s_l^+, s_l^- \, \hat{\gamma}_l^{(1)}(T) \Big] + \Big[\hat{\gamma}_l^{(2)}(T)\, s_l^-, s_l^+ \varrho_{\mathrm{s}} \Big] + \Big[\varrho_{\mathrm{s}} s_l^-, s_l^+ \, \hat{\gamma}_l^{(2)}(T) \Big] \Big) \tag{A10}$$

with

$$\hat{\gamma}_l^{(1)}(T) = \gamma_l \hat{\Omega}_l^3 \Big(N(\hat{\Omega}_l, T) + 1 \Big) , \tag{A11}$$

$$\hat{\gamma}_l^{(2)}(T) = \gamma_l \hat{\Omega}_l^3 N(\hat{\Omega}_l, T), \tag{A12}$$

and

$$N(\hat{\Omega}_l, T) = \Big(\mathrm{e}^{\hat{\Omega}_l \hbar / k_B T} - 1 \Big)^{-1} \tag{A13}$$

with $\hat{\Omega}_l$ given by (A3). The new term included in the von Neumann dynamics, H_{LS} we have:

$$H_{LS} = \sum_{l=1}^{N} \Big(\hat{\Gamma}_l^{(1)}(T) s_l^+ s_l^- + \hat{\Gamma}_l^{(2)}(T) s_l^- s_l^+ \Big) \tag{A14}$$

with

$$\hat{\Gamma}_l^{(1)}(T) = \frac{\gamma_l}{\pi\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{d}\omega \frac{\omega^3 \left(N(\omega) + 1 \right)}{\omega - \hat{\Omega}_l}, \tag{A15}$$

$$\hat{\Gamma}_l^{(2)}(T) = \frac{\gamma_l}{\pi\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{d}\omega \frac{\omega^3 N(\omega)}{\omega - \hat{\Omega}_l}. \tag{A16}$$

The term $\mathcal{D}[\varrho_{\mathrm{s}}]$ in (A10) describes spontaneous emission and thermally induced process which occur at a rate that depends on the energy level distribution of the spin chain and the correlation of these process for the different spins in the spin chain. The transition probabilities of the system due to the spontaneous emission process occur with rates that depends on the cubic power of the energy level difference of each spin, $\approx \gamma_l \hat{\Omega}_l^3$ while the probability of increasing energy states due to the thermally induced processes occur with a rate of $\gamma_l \hat{\Omega}_l^3 N(\hat{\Omega}_l)$ which decays exponentially for large energy states. On the other hand the term H_{LS} in (A14) commutes with the Hamiltonian of the system and contributes with a certain shift to the eigenenergies of the system. Typically this term is related to a Lamb shift effect and sometimes is simply neglected. This will be our case since we want to focus only on the non unitary dynamics effects of the bath. As the zero temperature limit is considered, this is, when the temperature of the bath is sufficiently small compared to the energy transitions of the linear chain, then one can do the limit $T \to 0$ in the operators (A11) and (A12) with (A13). In this case, the dissipative term of the master equation describes a pure spontaneous emission process:

$$\mathcal{D}[\varrho_{\mathrm{s}}] = -\sum_{l=1}^{N} \gamma_l \left\{ \Big[\hat{\Omega}_l^3 \, s_l^+, s_l^- \varrho_{\mathrm{s}} \Big] + \Big[\varrho_{\mathrm{s}} \, s_l^+, s_l^- \, \hat{\Omega}_l^3 \Big] \right\}.$$

At the finite temperature case, the system reaches a stationary state which is a mixture of states and as the temperature increases the states get closer together until it reaches an homogeneous mixture for infinite temperatures. At the zero temperature limit, the system reaches a stationary state which is a pure state as in the spontaneous emission process where all the states become populated during the transients and in the long time limit only the ground state becomes populated.

[1] H. Haken, "Laser theory," in *Light and Matter Ic / Licht und Materie Ic*, edited by L. Genzel (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1970) pp. 1–304.

[2] H. Haken, *Synergetics, Introduction and Advanced Topics* (Springer, 2004).

[3] E. Lutz and H. A. Weidenmller, Physica A **267**, 354 (1999).

[4] T. Gorin and T. H. Seligman, J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **4**, S386 (2002), topical issue: Mysteries and Paradoxes in Quantum Mechanics IV Quantum interference phenomena (Workshop held at Gargano, Italy, August 2001).

[5] M. Carrera, T. Gorin, and T. H. Seligman, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 022107 (2014).

[6] H. J. Moreno, T. Gorin, and T. H. Seligman, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 030104 (2015).

[7] M. Langemeyer and M. Holthaus, Phys. Rev. E **89**, 012101 (2014).

[8] R. Ketzmerick and W. Wustmann, Phys. Rev. E **82**, 021114 (2010).

[9] M. A. Prado, P. C. López, and T. Gorin, arXiv:1606.05815v1 [quant-ph].

[10] P. C. L. Vázquez and A. García, Physica Scripta **91**, 055101 (2016).

[11] S. A. Gardiner, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4790 (1997).

[12] T. P. Billam and S. A. Gardiner, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 023414 (2009).
[13] I. Dana and D. L. Dorofeev, Phys. Rev. E **72**, 046205 (2005).
[14] P. V. Elyutin and A. N. Rubtsov, J. Phys. A **41**, 055103 (2008).
[15] S. Fishman, D. R. Grempel, and R. E. Prange, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 509 (1982).
[16] P. W. Anderson, Rev. Mod. Phys. **50**, 191 (1978).
[17] B. v. T. Ad Lagendijk and D. S. Wiersma, Physics Today **62** (2009).
[18] G. P. Berman, G. D. Doolen, G. V. López, and V. I. Tsifrinovich, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 062305 (2000).
[19] G. V. López, J. Quezada, G. P. Berman, G. D. Doolen, and V. I. Tsifrinovich, J Opt B Quantum Semiclassical Opt **5**, 184 (2003).
[20] L. Viola and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 2733 (1998).
[21] L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2417 (1999).
[22] L. G. Rego, L. F. Santos, and V. S. Batista, Annual Review of Physical Chemistry **60**, 293 (2009).
[23] G. S. Uhrig, New Journal of Physics **10**, 083024 (2008).
[24] J. J. L. Morton, A. M. Tyryshkin, A. Ardavan, S. C. Benjamin, K. Porfyrakis, S. A. Lyon, and G. A. D. Briggs, Nat Phys **2**, 40 (2006).
[25] G.-Q. Liu, H. C. Po, J. Du, R.-B. Liu, and X.-Y. Pan, Nature Communications **4**, 2254 (2013).
[26] G. V. López and P. López, J. Mod. Phys. **3**, 85 (2011).
[27] P. C. López and G. V. López, J. Mod. Phys. **3**, 902 (2012).
[28] G. V. López and P. López, J. Mod. Phys. **4**, 68 (2013).
[29] H. P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, USA, 2002).
[30] S. Pasini, T. Fischer, P. Karbach, and G. S. Uhrig, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 032315 (2008).
[31] P. Rungta, V. Bužek, C. M. Caves, M. Hillery, and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 042315 (2001).
[32] F. Mintert, M. Kuś, and A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 167902 (2004).